

Attorney Docket MAE 289

**REMARKS**

[1] The drawings were objected to for lacking numerals 2, 4, and 15, mentioned in the text. This objection is respectfully traversed.

In the amendments of January 31, the Applicant amended the specification to refer to the "four image forming sections 2K, 2Y, 2M, and 2C (hereinafter also referred to generally, or as a group, by reference numeral 2)," and similarly for numerals 4 and 15. By this amendment the numerals 2, 4, and 15 are mentioned in the text, but only as alternatives to the same numerals combined with letters. The amended the specification makes it clear that the numerals alone refer to the same thing as the numerals with letters.

CFR 1.84 requires that "Reference characters mentioned in the description must appear in the drawing." However, the general numbers do appear in the drawing, with differentiating letters. This usage is analogous to subscripts on a variable, such as  $x_1, x_1, x_1$ ,

Moreover, the numerals alone are not *actual* reference characters because they do not indicate any particular feature—all of those particular features are already labeled. To clarify this, the specification is again amended to refer to "numbers" instead of "reference numerals."

The rule is believed to be complied with and there is no chance of confusion or of difficulty in reading, which is what the rule was intended to prevent. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection and the requirement is requested.

[2-4] Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under § 102 over Rogers IV, '018. This rejection is respectfully traversed as to claim 8; claim 3 is canceled.

Claim 8 recites that if print data contains a color for a detected image forming section, the control unit processes data for the color for the detected image forming section in a format that can be printed, and stores the data into a buffer. But, if the print data contains a color for a non-detected image forming section, the control unit *neither* processes data for the color for the non-

AMENDMENT

11

10/614,123

*Attorney Docket MAE 289*

detected image forming section into a format that can be printed, *nor* does it store the data in the buffer. The reason for this is that, the data being neither processed nor stored, the apparatus processes a minimum amount of data for printing, and thereby increasing the throughput of the printing apparatus.

Rogers does not disclose this feature. Rogers states (eighth paragraph of the Detailed Description), "If a toner cartridge [is missing, rather than being low on toner], the printer proceeds to print a monochrome image (step 48)." That is, that color data is processed and printed in black.

Claim 3 recites storing the color image in a memory, also contrary to instant claim 8. Rogers' other claims are contrary as well. Claim 2 states that all color images are printed in monochrome if the corresponding cartridge for that color image is missing. Claim 1 is similar, but prints in monochrome if the operator approves it. Claim 5 is another variation of claim 1. Claim 4 recites disabling the printer, and also does not anticipate.

[5-6] Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 9-22 were rejected under § 103 over Rogers IV in view of Endo '237. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 now recites features of a power supply transfer voltage (supported at page 22, lines 22-27), which are not supported in either reference. Neither Rogers nor Endo is seen to mention a transfer voltage or even a power supply, much less disclose the claimed subject matter. Independent claim 6 is patentable for the same reason.

The subject matter of claim 7 is not seen in the references.

Claim 9 recites a selecting unit that allows a user to select an image forming section that performs printing and an image forming section that does not perform printing. This feature is not disclosed by either of the references.

*AMENDMENT*

12

*10/614,123*

*Attorney Docket MAE 289*

The Examiner relies on Endo for disclosing plural sections that can act independently (drums 101a-101d). However, the four image-forming sections of Endo are not detachable, and therefore Endo does not operate in the same way as the Applicant's apparatus.

New claim 23 is patentable by its dependence.

Respectfully submitted,

September 12, 2005  
Date

Nick Bromer  
Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)  
(717) 426-1664  
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23995  
Telephone: (202) 371-8976  
Telefax : (202) 408-0924

*I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 571-273-8300) on September 12, 2005.*

Nick Bromer [reg. no. 33,478]

Signature Nick Bromer

AMENDMENT

13

10/614,123